Summerton shares successful techniques for streambank restoration

By ANDREW OVERBECK

NEWPORT, N.H. — Unsatisfied with the results of standard rip-rap rock installations to control streambank erosion, superintendent Gary Summerton at John H. Cain Golf Club here has worked to find a more natural solution to rebuild eroded stream banks. Summerton, along with landscape architect John Sullivan, has used a streambank restoration process on some areas at John H. Cain and this summer completed a job at neighboring Twin Lake Villa Golf Course.

At John H. Cain, 12 holes sit on a flood plain and the course faces a yearly assault from the south branch of the Sugar River, which regularly overflows its banks. “In 1995 and 1996, they had seven 100-year storms that caused a lot of damage,” said Summerton. “Major damage occurred in areas that were cleared for holes crossing the river and where the bridges were put in.”

In fact, the streambank erosion altered the layout of the 18th hole. The river carved a new channel that bisected the approach to the 18th green, and after two attempts to fill it in, failed, the hole had to be redesigned.

When Summerton came on board in 1997, he put in more than 1,200 feet of rip-rap along the new channel on the 18th hole, “It worked well,” he said. “But it was causing problems because it deflected the force of the water downstream. So I began to seek other alternatives.”

In 1998, Summerton teamed up with Sullivan to restore 200 feet of streambank along the 10th hole, where erosion was threatening the cart path.

“We first put in a rock sock at the toe of the channel that bisected the approach to the 10th hole. The river carved a new stream. So I began to work on that project.”

Avoiding the perils and pitfalls of regulatory permits

By GREGORY W. PHILLIPS, JR.

Nearly everyone in the world of golf course development knows of projects that were delayed or completely abandoned when permitting procedures hit a brick wall. Development work requires a lot of interaction with regulatory officials at all levels, federal, state and local. A developer who tackles the process the right way can save a great deal of time and money and avoid a lot of headaches.

The following strategies can be useful in several key areas: determining which permits are required for your project, and figuring out how to apply for and acquire them while meeting your budget and your construction schedule.

TAKING THE INITIATIVE

Your first step—and this is critical—is establishing a person at each agency to serve as your point of contact. Your contact will be the one you call whenever you have a question. He or she will be the one on the receiving end of all your permit-application paperwork. Ideally, you want someone with decision-making authority.

As soon as a course architect is selected, begin calling each agency. You want to introduce yourself and also provide background on the project, including your prospective timetables. In that first call, you can also ask what other agencies you need to deal with. Try to get specific names of officials you can talk with.

Regulatory agencies can provide valuable information. For starters, they know which permits are required from agencies other than themselves, because they deal with them regularly. Consulting with these officials will go a long way in insuring you have covered your bases. It will also help establish a positive rapport all around.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Most often, the first agency to contact is the regulatory branch of the Corps of Engineers (COE) in your area. It is almost a given you will need to speak to them sooner or later, so you might as well give them the impression you are proactive.

By taking the initiative, you show that you’re not attempting to duck any issues. This may sound like putting your hand in a wasp nest, but it’s best to find out up front what permits and accompanying fees will be required. This will help you with budgets, schedules and designs.

As the construction documents evolve, consult with your contacts on the environmental issues that may be affected by the course’s design. Elements that alter, create, alter, affect waterways, streams and wetland areas should be discussed with your contacts as soon as possible. The course architect will have a sense for the regulatory ramifications of the design, but it’s best to be able to pick up the phone and get at least a preliminary “read” on regulators’ concerns.

If they raise a legitimate issue about some specific aspect of your plan, you must make alterations and address those concerns before you even apply for your permit. When you ask a question, it is important to communicate as specifically as possible what your intentions are. Agreat way to do this is to make a copy of an architectural or engineering documents, and fax them over to the regulators for an early review.

When you do that, you effectively cut the permit acquisition process. The regulators will have a sense of what’s coming, and you’ll have a sense for what they will and won’t approve. The alternative is to complete construction documents, then apply for the permits, wait through a review period, and then find out your application has been denied. Now, after wasting all that time and money, you are back to square one.

Also, keep in mind that review periods are often based on the scale of the activity. For example, the review period for a 404 for wetland mitigation is determined by the acreage you are reclaiming. If you can stay under the one-third acre limit, you can cut the review time substantially.

KEEP CHANNELS OPEN

Another mistake is assuming that regulatory agencies talk to one another about your plan. Although they have a feel for the kind of permits each agency requires, regulatory agencies do not talk to each other about projects. It is the developer’s responsibility to assure that all permits are in place and everyone is kept in the loop.

You might obtain the required permit from the Corps of Engineers and assume that you’re good to go. Then, one day, an official from the state or county shows up and knows nothing of your project. The developer/owner is shocked that the COE did not notify everyone of what was going on.

Try to see things through the eyes of the regulator. Generally...
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OLD SILO
At Old Silo, Marsh and Kubly worked a land deal with Sterling Development, which is handling the residential portion of the project. The two built the course and will operate and manage it.
Old Silo, which cost approximately 94.2 million to build, sits on 200 acres of gently rolling pasture land. The course plays from four different sets of tees and measures 6,977 yards from the tips. "We wanted to build a first-class facility," said Marsh. "We agonized over this course. It was a difficult piece of property. There are lots of rolling hills but not much space between them."
"There were only certain places we could go with the course," he said. "But we moved only 350,000 cubic yards of earth."
Kubly and his crew also had to do a large amount of rock blasting to make certain holes work. "A lot of people would have given up on the 9th hole," said Kubly. "We spent a lot of money on dynamite, but we decided to make it right."
The layout's namesake resides on the 16th hole, a 432-yard par 4 featuring an old farm silo that guards the left side of the fairway.
Marsh's favorite spots on the course are the elevated 6th and 7th tees, which afford outstanding views of the course and surrounding countryside.

WILD MARSH
In addition to Old Silo, the two are also co-owners of Wild Marsh Golf Club in Buffalo, Minn. "Wild Marsh, which was formerly called Buffalo Run, had been designed and built by the owners and was experiencing problems because of the layout and the difficulty of the course," said Jenkins. "We bought it from the creditors and decided to invest in the course and turn it into a good deal."
The Graham Marsh redesigned course opened June 12.
Going forward, Marsh and Kubly are working on a potential deal to build a course in South Dakota, and Jenkins said there are five other projects that Landscapes Unlimited has under development. "Ownership is a pretty good compliment to construction. Our plan is to do several of these a year. In general, these will be new construction in residential development where we have an agreement with the developer who is doing the housing component. We will take on the responsibility to finance, build and operate the course," said Jenkins. "Our core business is golf course construction, but this is getting to be an integral part of our business."

Streambank restoration
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slope and then put down two layers of coco fiber. After that we put in rolls containing wetland plants such as irises, sedges, dogwoods, pussy willows and viburnums. This was all tied in and then hammered into the bank," said Summerton. "The advantage, once the plants have been established, is that when destructive forces come through, the plant material is there to absorb the force of the water instead of deflecting it elsewhere."
The project, which was approximately 70 percent hand work, cost $10,000, about the same amount as a rip-rap installation, according to Summerton. "It also looks a lot better," he said. "It has been two years, and it looks like a native streambank. Over on the 18th, the rip-rap is just starting to fill in with plants."
The permitting process was also faster, taking just two months to get approval for the work on the 10th hole, as opposed to the six to eight months that it took to get approval for the work on the 18th hole.
The area has been tested several times since it was rebuilt, and Summerton hopes to restore 3,000 to 4,000 more feet of streambank on the course in the next three to five years.
As a result of the successful restoration at John H. Cain Golf Course, Summerton and Sullivan were approached this summer to do similar work at Twin Lake Villa Golf Course, a 9-hole executive layout, in New London.